

Appl. No. 10/604,307
Amendment dated December 9, 2005
Reply to Office Action of Nov. 10, 2005


Remarks/Arguments:

Claims 1-25 are presented for examination. Claims 13-24 (invention II) are provisionally elected for examination, with traverse.

Applicant traverses the requirement to restrict between inventions I and II. As relevant to inventions I and II, the Office Action of 11/10/2005 presented an election/restriction requirement between combination and subcombination. Invention I is characterized as the combination and relates to rotation limiter. Invention II is characterized as the subcombination of a steering shaft and rotation limiter. Both are apparatus claims and are supported by the disclosure of a steering limiter apparatus.

Traverse is premised upon the lack of significant burden between examining the combination and subcombination. The difference is more a matter of claim scope and claim strategy than difference in inventive structure or function. As a claiming strategy, and by way of example without limitation, invention I would apply to the competitive manufacture or sale of a rotation limiter; while invention II would apply to the competitive use such a device on the preferred embodiment – a steering shaft. On this basis, applicant requests reconsideration of the election/restriction requirement as to inventions I and II.

Respectfully submitted,



Kyle W. Rost, Reg. No. 27943
Attorney for Applicants

5490 S. Autumn Court
Greenwood Village, CO 80111
Phone 720-528-8863
Fax 720-528-8864